

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2003.

In that Office Action claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing terms and language that generally render the claims, in the Examiner's opinion, ambiguous. In response to this rejection, and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, minor amendments have been made to various ones of the claims that are believed to remove the Examiner's grounds for rejection.

Specifically, with regard to independent claims 1, 8, 14, 19, 28 and 29, minor amendments have been made to more positively recite the structure that comprises the cables that intercouple the locking pin at each locking mechanism with the actuating number of the locking mechanism at an opposite end of the cross part. It is believed that these amendments remove the Examiner's grounds for rejection and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With regard to the dependent claims, the Examiner will note that minor amendments have been made to address the various instances where the Examiner believed that antecedent basis was lacking, or that a dependent claim was ambiguous because of language used in its associated independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comment, it is believed that the claims are now presently in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. The undersigned also wishes to express his appreciation for the careful review of the application given by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that personal contact would help to expedite allowance in the present application, he is requested to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 11, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/ss